R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 807 VT 003 292

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS, A REPRINT FROM THE 1967 MANPOWER REPORT.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION (DOL), WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, *JOB TRAINING, *EMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYED, DISADVANTAGED GROUPS, ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY,

THE NEW DIRECTIONS WERE THE OUTGROWTH OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS INCLUDING RISING EMPLOYMENT, EMERGING LABOR SHORTAGES, AND CONTINUED HARD CORE UNEMPLOYMENT. A DISTINGUISHING FEATURE OF 1966 WAS THE EXTENT TO WHICH IDEAS WERE BROUGHT FROM THE PLANNING OR TESTING STAGE TO INNOVATIVE ACTION BY MANY AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT. THE OVERRIDING CONCERN IN THESE ACTIONS WAS TO DEAL MORE EFFECTIVELY AND FUNDAMENTALLY WITH THE PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED, BUT IMPORTANT STEPS WERE ALSO TAKEN TO HELP MEET SKILL SHORTAGE PROBLEMS AND TO COORDINATE MANPOWER PROGRAMS WITH OTHER RELATED STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS. MANY BUSINESSES AND INDUSTRIES RECRUITED, EMPLOYED, AND TRAINED DISADVANTAGED WORKERS AND COOPERATED IN EFFORTS TO MEET HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND OTHER SOCIAL PROBLEMS. MANY NATIONAL LABOR UNIONS STIMULATED UPGRADING TRAINING TO IMPROVE SKILLS AND OPEN OPPORTUNITIES FOR LARGE MEMBERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED IN ENTRY OCCUPATIONS. SPECIFIC SUBJECTS DISCUSSED ARE (1) REACHING AND SERVING THE DISADVANTAGED THROUGH THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, MULTISERVICE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS, AND REFOCUSED MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT (MDTA) PROGRAMS, (2) IMPROVING EMPLOYABILITY THROUGH MDTA TRAINING, NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROJECTS, PROGRAMS FOR WELFARE CLIENTS, AND STATEWIDE PROJECTS, (3) INITIATING NEW FORMS OF JOB DEVELOPMENT THROUGH INDUSTRY COOPERATION, YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CAMPAIGNS, AND WORK-TRAINING PROGRAMS, (4) INITIATING INNOVATIONS IN OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING, (5) MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF SPECIAL GROUPS, SUCH AS OLDER WORKERS, AMERICAN INDIANS, MEXICAN-AMERICANS, TEXAS MIGRATORY WORKERS, DISADVANTAGED SERVICEMEN AND REJECTEES, AND PRISON INMATES, AND (6) IMPLEMENTING NEW ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES, SUCH AS USE OF COORDINATING TEAMS, JOINT FUNDING, AND NATIONAL-STATE PLANNING. THE REPORT WAS AN ACCOUNT OF PROGRAM BEGINNINGS RATHER THAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS. THIS ARTICLE IS A REPRINT FROM "1967 MANPOWER REPORT" AND IS AVAILABLE FROM THE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF MANPOWER POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 14TH STREET AND CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210. (WB)

ED016807

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS.

A REPRINT FROM THE 1967 MANPOWER REPORT

VT003292

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR - Manpower Administration

CONTENTS

New Directions in Manpower Programs

	Page
Reaching and serving the disadvantaged	48
The Human Resources Development program	48
Multiservice neighborhood centers	49
Refocusing of MDTA programs	50
Improving employability	51
Neighborhood Youth Corps	52
Programs for welfare clients	52
The Mississippi statewide projects	53
New forms of job development	54
Enlisting industry cooperation	54
Work-training programs	56
Innovations in occupational training	57
New departures in the MDTA program	57
The OIC program	60
Vocational education	60
Meeting the problems of special groups	62
Older workers	62
American Indians	63
Mexican Americans	64
Texas migratory workers	65
Disadvantaged servicemen and rejectees	65
Prison inmates	66
New administrative policies	67
The comprehensive approach	68
Joint funding	69
National-State planning	69

The President sends to the Congress each year a report on the Nation's manpower as required by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Published together in that report are the *Manpower Report of the President* and an accompanying comprehensive report by the Department of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

This is a reprint of the chapter on New Directions in Manpower Programs from the Department of Labor's report.

Information regarding reprints of other sections of the *1967 Manpower Report* may be obtained at the locations listed on the inside back cover.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The changing nature of the Nation's manpower problems led, in 1966, to major changes of direction in manpower policy and program, which were strongly supported by congressional action.

The new emphases were the logical outgrowth of economic developments reviewed in the previous chapter—rising employment and emerging labor shortages and, at the same time, persistent hard-core unemployment. They grew, too, out of increasing sophistication in applying manpower measures as an instrument of public policy and a mounting confidence that intelligence, determination, and the proper tools could bring about much fuller utilization of the country's human resources.

The civil rights movement had heightened attention to the severity of unemployment among minority groups. The War on Poverty had opened the eyes of the Nation to the distress in urban slums and impoverished rural areas not adequately served by the conventional programs. Four years of experience under the Manpower Development and Training Act had shown that flexible training programs could be devised and coupled with other necessary services to provide an effective bridge to employment for even the most severely deprived. And, finally, congressional action in 1966 went far toward filling the gaps in authorized manpower programs and permitting needed adjustments.

Many of the new program directions of 1966, which are the subject of this chapter, flowed from ideas discussed or tested in preceding years. What distinguished 1966 was the extent to which ideas were brought from the planning or testing stage to innovative action by many agencies of the Government.

The overriding concern in these new program actions was to deal more effectively and fundamentally with the problems of the disadvantaged. But important steps were taken also to help in meeting skill shortage problems.

Better coordination of manpower and related programs was another major goal. High priority was assigned to developing integrated national-State planning of these programs. And extensive efforts were made to insure that the resources of all concerned Government and private agencies would be brought to bear effectively on manpower problems, both nationally and in local communities.

Another significant new direction in 1966 was the growing participation of business and industry in manpower development and utilization programs, sparked in part by personnel shortages in many occupations. Employers have demonstrated a growing awareness that they have a role to play in enabling disadvantaged people to become productive workers. Many companies have not only reached out into their communities to recruit, employ, and train disadvantaged workers, but have also cooperated in efforts to meet housing, transportation, and other social problems.[1]

---

[1] These developments are documented in recent reports of the National Industrial Conference Board, and are being encouraged by such national employer organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and Plans for Progress.

A parallel development has been the strong initiative of many national labor unions in stimulating upgrading training, to improve skills and to open opportunities for large numbers of disadvantaged workers in entry occupations.

Since many of the programs which reflect these new directions got underway toward the end of 1966, this chapter is to a great extent an account of program beginnings rather than accomplishments. During 1967, these programs—many of them pilot projects—must be closely monitored, and the insights and experience gained must then be applied as widely as possible. Strengthened efforts must be made also to eliminate overlaps and inconsistencies and reduce the administrative difficulties communities face in seeking to utilize the resources available to them under Government manpower programs.

A concentrated attack on the problems of joblessness and poverty in urban slums and the poorest rural areas will represent the paramount new direction of program action during 1967. These problems and the actions undertaken to meet them are dealt with in the next two chapters.

Reaching and Serving the Disadvantaged

The most disadvantaged of this Nation's citizens—those least able to qualify for or find work without substantial help—are also those least likely to seek out or even know about the training, placement, and other services potentially available to them. Historically, unemployed workers and others needing manpower services have been expected to find the appropriate agencies and take their problems there. But many of the present unemployed and underemployed are disillusioned, apathetic, or hostile, and have cultural barriers and communication difficulties. Those in rural areas—and even many in urban slums—may be located far away from sources of help and have little, if any, knowledge of these services.

From early experience under the MDTA and related programs, it was evident that many of these people were, in the words of the Secretary of Labor, "slipping through the mesh of the employment-welfare-opportunity program * * *. We have been waiting for them to come to us instead of going to them." As he pointed out, more active approaches were needed to reach the disadvantaged.

Experimental and demonstration (E&D) projects, beginning as early as 1963 under the Manpower Development and Training Act, had proved that positive programs of "outreach" can search out the marginally employable, the chronically unemployed, even those who have abandoned the search for work, and encourage them to take advantage of opportunities for change.

As a result, broader efforts to make needed services readily accessible to the poor were undertaken in 1965. A network of Youth Opportunity Centers was established in War on Poverty target areas by the Federal-State Employment Service system. The YOC's provide services for all young people seeking work and also, as an important element, reach out to disadvantaged youth in order to help them increase their employability and get jobs. At the same time, neighborhood centers were established in many urban neighborhoods by Community Action agencies, a major arm of the War on Poverty. These centers, within walking distance of as many slum residents as possible, provide information about existing services and, to the extent feasible, actually house needed services. Employment Service personnel, for example, are now stationed in many such centers to provide counseling, job market information, training referral, placement, and related services there—thus eliminating the need for travel to a distant central office.

THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Building on these and other person-oriented efforts to find work for the chronically unemployed, a broad Human Resources Development (HRD) program was undertaken by the Employment Service in August 1966. Limited operations had begun in all States by the end of the year.

The prototype was a pilot "intensive service" program in four slum neighborhoods of Chicago. Under the sponsorship of the Mayor's Committee on Manpower, city, State, and Federal agencies joined forces with representatives of business and minority groups and community agencies. The approach was first to conduct a door-to-door, person-to-person survey of employment needs in the target areas and then to follow through with a two-pronged effort to (1) work with employers to increase employment opportunities for the disadvantaged and (2) help disadvantaged individuals prepare and qualify for these jobs. Experimental programs of the same kind—featuring an intensive door-to-door outreach approach and testing a variety of techniques for meeting the problems of those interviewed—were undertaken in St. Louis, Houston, Rochester, New York City, and, in modified form, in Watts and the entire south central Los Angeles area. All projects confirmed the need for and response to such outreach and the accompanying need for more training and job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed.[2]

To provide operating bases for the new HRD program, the Youth Opportunity Centers, now established in 127 metropolitan areas throughout the country, have expanded their functions to provide service to the disadvantaged in all age groups. In addition, the facilities and services of ongoing organizations in slum neighborhoods—including Community Action Program centers, Employment Service offices, and settlement houses—are being widely utilized. In some rural areas the mobile units of the Employment Service's Smaller Communities Program are also beginning to be used.

In slum areas, people from the same neighborhood and culture can, with far greater acceptance and effectiveness than strangers, go from house to house and win response from men and women often mistrustful and hostile to public agency programs. So, the outreach staff in the HRD program are, as far as possible, neighborhood residents who have received special training.

At the HRD centers, special counseling staff work individually with persons encouraged to come in by the outreach staff and plan how to remove the obstacles to their employment. If personal difficulties such as living conditions, family or child-care problems, legal and credit questions, and problems of clothing or tools or transportation hamper employability, or if problems of physical or mental health stand in the way, the welfare and health services of the community are called on under cooperative arrangements. The plan for each individual may include, in any needed combination, basic education, other pretraining preparation, work-experience programs, and institutional, on-the-job, or apprenticeship training. For youth the plan may also involve referral to the Neighborhood Youth Corps or Job Corps. Heavy emphasis is being placed on gaining the cooperation of employers, to insure that trainees will be able to find suitable job openings when ready for competitive employment.

MULTISERVICE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

Since neighborhood centers like the Youth Opportunity Centers and those operated by Community Action agencies are clearly providing a greatly needed channel of communication and service, the establishment of multiservice neighborhood centers in every ghetto area was made a national goal by Presidential directive in August 1966.

The purpose is to provide an even wider range of on-the-spot services on a coordinated basis—to overcome problems not only of distance and transportation expense but of specialization and organizational separation which have all too often interfered with the availability of needed social, health, manpower, recreational, and educational services. In many cases the available services have been fragmentary and uneven, or located in city centers far from poverty areas. And complex eligibility procedures often stand in the way.

Pilot demonstration projects with various multiservice center approaches are being arranged for initially in 14 cities—Boston, Chattanooga, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dallas, Detroit, Jacksonville, Louisville, Minneapolis, New York, Oakland, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Washington. These cities all have unquestioned need for assistance in solving the urgent human problems in their slum areas, have cooperative and interested local governments, and expect to contribute to the cost of the projects. A principal objective is to develop

[2] These findings regarding the responsiveness of persons often characterized as "unemployable" were borne out by an outreach project of the Connecticut State Employment Service in Hartford (discussed in the following section on new forms of job development) and by various experimental and demonstration projects which had focused particularly on youth.

improved patterns of Federal, State, and local cooperation in providing neighborhood services. The Community Action agencies will have a central role in this undertaking, which will seek to develop services highly responsive to the needs and desires of the people of the neighborhood and yet utilize the expertise of professional service agencies.

The pilot programs will utilize and test several different organizational approaches:

—An advice and referral center that chiefly provides information and directs people to specialized agencies for services. Such centers will also engage in outreach, advocacy, and followup services and may provide transportation.

—A diagnostic and limited service center that has a central intake and analysis unit to interview people, ascertain needs, and refer or take them to specialized agencies linked to the center. Limited on-the-spot services may also be provided at the center or within walking distance of it.

—A comprehensive multipurpose center that, ideally, is a social service "shopping plaza," housing under one roof or within walking distance as many community social agencies as possible and providing central outreach, intake, diagnosis, advocacy, followup, and community organization functions.

The aim in all three types of programs is to provide easy access to:

—Manpower services, including aptitude appraisal, employment counseling, and placement services; relocation counseling services; adult and remedial education; work-experience training; prevocational and vocational training (including on-the-job training and classroom instruction); and such supportive services as bonding and assistance in moving.

—Health and welfare services, including physical and mental health consultations and examinations, family life and rehabilitation counseling services, and financial and other maintenance services.

—Adult and remedial education, cultural enrichment programs, and similar activities.

—Information on citizens' rights and legal services.

—Housing assistance and recreational activities.

—Senior citizens' activities.

—Youth development resources.

—Child development and parent information services.

The pilot programs are being developed by the communities themselves, with emphasis on grassroots planning and provision of public and private services. The Federal Government can break bottlenecks and provide resources, but the active involvement of the city and the neighborhood is crucial. The local sponsor must achieve consensus and cooperative arrangements, including definite arrangements for coordination with and assistance from the city and State governments.

To carry out Federal responsibilities for funding and providing technical assistance and information, five Federal agencies have organized a Joint Steering Committee, under the chairmanship of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the program of Neighborhood Facilities Grants, established by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, this Department is to help finance the construction and rehabilitation of buildings used by the centers. Other agencies participating are the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Bureau of the Budget, which have joined with HUD in developing guidelines and standards for the centers and will assist in evaluating the projects and providing guides for wider application of the multiservice center idea. State agencies are also expected to play a major role.

REFOCUSING OF MDTA PROGRAMS

Since its enactment, the Manpower Development and Training Act has been a living, changing law, with substantial amendment on three occasions, and the MDTA programs have demonstrated flexibility and capacity to adapt quickly to changing needs. At the start, in 1962, fear of technological displacement was the uppermost concern. Occupations in which opportunities were growing were identified, and displaced but experienced workers were trained to fill them. As concern grew for the problem of jobless youth,

special youth programs were developed to provide young people with entry skills. When a widespread need for basic education prior to vocational training became apparent, the Congress responded by authorizing basic literacy training. As experience accumulated, it was evident that MDTA programs were functioning effectively, within the limits of their funding, for large numbers of unemployed people who could be brought into the mainstream of employment.

In 1966, however, a redirection of the MDTA program was called for by the changing manpower situation. It was decided, as a national training goal, that approximately 65 percent of the entire training effort would be "person oriented," directed to reclaiming the hard-core unemployed. Special groups with the greatest employment difficulties were identified: Culturally impoverished and poorly educated youth, the unemployed of middle age or older, minority groups, persons with low educational achievement, the long-term unemployed, and the rural poor. And guidelines were established to assure a spread of training opportunities among these groups.

The balance of the training effort—approximately 35 percent of the total—was to be "job oriented," focusing on the need for trained personnel in skill shortage categories.

With the funds available, the target set for fiscal year 1967 was training for 250,000 individuals—a reduction from the 275,000 total for the previous year, since it was recognized that the new emphasis on the disadvantaged would require more intensive effort with many individual trainees. Training emphasis was to be equally divided between institutional and on-the-job training, and special attention was to be given to enlisting greater assistance from industry in training for upgrading and in providing opportunity for the disadvantaged.

It was recognized that no sharp dividing line could in fact be drawn between the two aspects of the training program—human reclamation and the remedy of skill shortages; that some in the disadvantaged groups would, through training, enter the shortage occupations where production and service needs were greatest, and that others, unskilled, would move into jobs vacated as semiskilled and skilled workers moved up the job ladder as a result of upgrading training. The program called for all possible measures to enable disadvantaged workers with potential to enter occupations through which they could move upward to higher skill levels.

Flexibility in program planning based on local supply and demand situations, the availability of training facilities, and other factors is anticipated and desired. But analysis of State-by-State programs indicates that, by and large, the national goals will be met or nearly met in the current fiscal year. In fiscal 1968, with more leadtime available for planning and little change in basic program emphasis foreseen, full realization of the national training objectives is expected.

Improving Employability

The task of bringing people with the greatest employment difficulties to a position of employability and self-support is never simple. In many cases, occupational training cannot be undertaken effectively until a great deal of preliminary effort has gone into modifying attitudes, bolstering confidence, developing positive motivation, and providing needed work orientation.

To develop and test effective approaches for increasing employability, experimental and demonstration projects were set up under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Further insights have been gained through the Human Resources Development program and through experience under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, and other War on Poverty programs.

To permit wider application of the techniques thus developed, the Congress, in a 1966 amendment to the MDTA, authorized training in communications and "employment" skills, with or without occupational training. ("Employment" skills include, for example, job-finding skills, improved work habits, and work and social attitudes conducive to satisfactory occupational adjustment.) Thus, employability training and basic education

may now be provided to persons who already have occupational skills but need these other kinds of training to become employable, as well as to persons who also need occupational training.

In considering the problem of deficient communications skills, the House Committee on Labor and Public Welfare pointed to "excellent work * * * at Howard University and other locations * * * showing that what may seem to be impenetrable ignorance and near illiteracy * * * may well be merely the result of having learned to communicate in a substantially different way than that of the prospective employer or the members of the public with whom the worker will have to deal."[3]

The need for the amendment was confirmed by reports from Employment Service and welfare officials that many jobseekers cannot be placed, despite tightness in the job market, because of unfamiliarity with basic requirements of work; a record of excessive absenteeism, careless work, or job hopping; and lack of knowledge of how to look for jobs or present their qualifications to employers. Many foreign-born people were also reported to have particular need for improved knowledge of English.

Another 1966 amendment to the MDTA which will help to remove barriers to employment for many individuals authorizes a moderate expenditure (not more than $100 in any individual case) for physical examinations, minor medical treatment, or prostheses for trainees needing such help and unable to obtain it otherwise. The purpose is to reduce problems common to all MDTA programs—the large number of dropouts from training for health reasons and the inability of many workers who have completed training to pass preemployment physical examinations.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

In the 2 years since the first Neighborhood Youth Corps contract was signed, more than four-fifths of a million disadvantaged young Americans in all 50 States have been helped—through work experience in both in-school and out-of-school programs—to begin their climb toward satisfying work careers.

This already large contribution to the work preparation of disadvantaged youth is being further strengthened under the Economic Opportunity Act amendments of 1966. In particular, the provision for training at the worksite for out-of-school youth, combined where needed with basic literacy and other education and training, will help to develop good work habits. Furthermore, both work experience and work opportunities in industry now may be arranged with private employers. In these cases, the private employers pay the wages, and NYC the training costs.

Because NYC youth generally need further occupational training in order to qualify for satisfactory permanent jobs, another 1966 MDTA amendment was designed to facilitate the movement of NYC enrollees into MDTA occupational training. In the past, very few NYC youth have enrolled in such courses—chiefly because the MDTA youth allowance of $20 a week represented a substantial drop from the NYC wage of $1.25 an hour, and it was thus very difficult to interest NYC enrollees in further preparation for work. Now, NYC youth entering MDTA courses may receive the regular training allowance paid to adult trainees, which is equivalent to the average weekly unemployment insurance payment in the given State.

To implement this amendment, some training slots in MDTA courses scheduled to start in early 1967 have been set aside specifically for NYC youth. And exploratory programs in 10 cities will examine in detail how the NYC work-experience and MDTA training programs best can be coordinated on a nationwide basis.

PROGRAMS FOR WELFARE CLIENTS

An obviously disadvantaged group whose employability is being increased through work-experience projects are those who have found it necessary to seek assistance from public welfare agencies.

The 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act introduced the concept of rehabilitation, rather than simply financial support, by establishing a Community Work and Training Program for persons 18 years of age or older receiving assistance in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children

[3] "Manpower Development and Training Amendments of 1966" (Washington: 89th Cong., 2d sess., U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, September 8, 1966), Report No. 2017, p. 4.

Program. The objective was to instill better work habits in enrollees, to enable them to get and hold a job.

Under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, this concept was expanded and the program made a part of the War on Poverty. This Work-Experience Program (as it was then called) serves not only those on welfare but also "other needy persons"—largely those who would be eligible for public assistance except for technical reasons. The focus has continued to be on unemployed adults, primarily the parents of dependent children. Maximum use is made of community resources to provide manpower and social services, including basic education, vocational instruction, work experience, job motivation and counseling, needed supportive services, and assistance in finding suitable employment after training. The aim has been flexibility in services, based on assessment of trainee needs and the development of an individual employability plan.

Experience to date has demonstrated the program's considerable potential for social and economic rehabilitation of severely disadvantaged individuals. Much stress has been placed on improving literacy levels as the basis for further education and training. Frequently the presence of a supporting service has made the difference between success and failure. Resolution of a health or child-care problem, for example, will enable many with learning capacity to enter education, training, and work-experience programs and ultimately to become successfully employed.

The Work-Experience and Training Program, as renamed in 1966, is funded on a project basis and is conducted by local and State public assistance agencies. Currently, more than 260 projects with a total enrollment of about 67,000 persons are operating in all States except one, and in the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

By law, the program coordinates its efforts with those of the public school system and the public Employment Service, and it has secured the cooperation of public agencies, private, nonprofit organizations, and private employers. Under related 1966 amendments to both the Economic Opportunity Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act, a closer tie-in with manpower services to improve employability, provided by the Department of Labor, is now required.

Under the transitional provisions of the amendments, projects which come up for renewal just before and after the July 1, 1967 changeover date will be reviewed and the training and other manpower services provided will be strengthened as needed. New projects will be so organized as to insure that all educational, training, and work-training resources in the community are drawn upon, to enable persons on welfare to become independent.

In the first 2½ years of the MDTA program, only about 10 percent of the trainees were persons who had received some form of assistance just prior to enrollment. Most of these were heads of families. However, this proportion should and will be significantly increased. A 1966 amendment providing for incentive payments for trainees from families on public assistance, together with the current focus on the severely disadvantaged, should result in a marked increase in the proportion of MDTA trainees from welfare rolls.

THE MISSISSIPPI STATEWIDE PROJECTS

A major statewide attack on illiteracy and unemployment through a combination of Federal, State, and local government and private efforts has been undertaken through two separate programs in Mississippi, one initiated late in 1965 and the other in mid-1966.

The first, known as STAR (Systematic Training and Redevelopment), was developed as a nondenominational program under sponsorship of the statewide Natchez-Jackson Diocese of the Roman Catholic Church, with funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the experimental and demonstration program of the Department of Labor. Through 15 regional centers, it was planned to bring thousands of people up to at least the sixth-grade literacy level, to improve their employability. It was expected that vocational preparation for 1,500 would then be possible, largely through MDTA projects, although there were at the time only 15 MDTA courses in operation or in preparation in the State.

Impetus for the program came from the extremely high rate of unemployment (as much as 20 percent) in some counties of the rural cotton-producing Delta Area, coupled with the high rate of illiteracy in the State. Industry, attracted to

262-297 O - 67 - 2

the Delta Area by promise of an ample labor supply brought about by displacements from agriculture, had found that the available workers were not sufficiently literate to qualify for immediate employment or for skill training. This finding was not surprising. In 1960, 160,000 Mississippi residents aged 25 or older had had less than 5 years of schooling and nearly 41,000 had never attended school at all.

By late 1966, more than 5,300 people had finished the 13-week basics course which was the heart of the STAR program. In addition to reading and writing, the course included accelerated work in basic arithmetic, some grounding in practical social studies, and education in employment practices and job performance standards.

The outcome has been disappointing initially with respect to progress into MDTA courses. Only 206 of the trainees were able to qualify for such courses. And only 331 found employment before or after the STAR training course ended. Longer term remedial work to bring these workers to a higher literacy level, as well as the development of more job opportunities for them, will obviously be essential for a real solution to their unemployment problems.

The second project, also statewide, stemmed from a survey in 13 counties of the State in early 1966 indicating that labor demand warranted training for a wider range of occupations and skill levels. This led to provision for expanded training throughout the State. By the end of fiscal 1966, MDTA training courses and on-the-job training projects had provided opportunities for nearly 6,000 trainees in a large number of occupations. In addition, Neighborhood Youth Corps projects gave opportunities for work-experience training or summer jobs to several thousand youth.

This program is continuing in fiscal 1967 and is funded to carry over into 1968, through the cooperative efforts of several Federal agencies.

New Forms of Job Development

ENLISTING INDUSTRY COOPERATION

With increased understanding of the problems of jobless youth and the hard-core unemployed has come growing recognition of the urgent need for the cooperation of private industry in the development and employment of these human resources. Direct employment on a "real paid job," before undertaking of specific skill training, can help motivate young people impatient with interviews and prolonged training courses as prelude to a pay envelope. One of the most encouraging developments of 1966 is the willingness of major segments of industry to undertake experiments in this direction, as indicated by the following examples of projects from among many that could be cited.

"Jobs Now" in Chicago

In Chicago, major industries are cooperating with Government and community agencies in an E&D project to provide employment and training for 3,000 problem youth, and the early results are so encouraging that plans are underway to develop similar efforts in other large cities.

Launched in September 1966, this demonstration project links as joint sponsors many of the city's principal industries, labor organizations, private community groups, and public agencies.

Youth are being enrolled in the program at the rate of 150 every 2 weeks, and there is a waiting list of candidates. Word has gone around that this project is different. In the first 3 months, 113 of the 212 young people who had been referred to jobs—gang leaders, delinquents, and others who have never held a steady job—were working and learning on jobs that promise them a future.

The key to the notable early success appears to be the active cooperation of employers in waiving their usual hiring standards and offering immediate employment with no questions asked. Employers are providing and financing training on the job in an understanding and encouraging atmosphere. Each trainee is under the direct supervision of a specially oriented worker responsible for helping him acquire job skills and compe-

tence, and for counseling him about personal and job-related problems. The only preliminary for the trainee is 2 weeks of prehiring orientation in human relations, grooming, money management, and even the city's transportation system, since many of the youth know little of the city beyond their own neighborhoods.

Another essential element is an active program of job development, carried on partly by men on loan from industry, to work out plans for the participation of other employers in the program. Personnel known as "service coaches" are also available to provide support for the trainees, both in the plant and at home, and for their supervisors.

The project is designed also for national use as a seedbed of successful techniques for transplant to other urban centers. This is accomplished through a program of 2-week seminars for successive groups of government, community agency, and industrial personnel from all parts of the country, who have responsibility for the recruitment, training, and employment of the disadvantaged.

The project's approaches stem from recent studies which challenge the commonly held view that street groups are so committed to antisocial behavior that they can be dealt with only by the police. It relies on documentation that the typical Chicago street youth is ambivalent, that he actually prefers a place in the competitive economy to the street code by which he has learned to live. He has little interest in low-paid, dead-end jobs. He wishes work with a decent paycheck and a chance to advance. And if he has shied away from seeking opportunities, it is because he lacks the qualifications for most entry jobs, probably has a police record, cannot show his true potential through aptitude tests because of low educational achievement, is not attracted by small training allowances, and has a low tolerance for delay, lengthy and repeated office interviews, and the strain of making job applications.

"Jobs Now" is dealing with these realities by offering immediate employment for wages, together with on-the-job training for occupations offering promise of advancement. The approach would be impossible without the socially motivated cooperation of employers. An advisory board including top officials of leading business and industrial firms and organized labor is establishing policy for the project and interpreting its goals to the business community.

The Hartford Project

Employer cooperation also made possible the substantial success of a project conducted by the Connecticut State Employment Service in an area of heavy unemployment in North Hartford. In December 1965 and January 1966, Employment Service staff, working evenings and weekends, went from door to door in this large slum area. The inventory thus made of persons interested in work or training showed a need for greatly increased training opportunities. A sizable multi-occupational project was set up, with funding under the MDTA, but a wide gap remained between the number who needed jobs or training, or both, and the number who could be referred to either. Great need was found also for remedial health, welfare, and other services. Lack of transportation or of day-care facilities was a further obstacle to employment for large numbers.

Some of the needs were met by local public and voluntary health and welfare agencies and cooperating State agencies. But the problem of lack of jobs remained. This was met, in part at least, by a statewide job-development program known as "PLACE." More than 4,500 employers were asked to "Please Look At Current Employables." As a result of this intensive promotional effort, more than 1,750 of the hard-core unemployed were placed in permanent jobs with private employers; and in a followup effort 2 months later, another 450 found work.

The Oakland Plan

Early in 1966, the Department of Commerce made known its willingness to invest substantial Economic Development funds in public works, business loans, and technical assistance in Oakland, Calif., an area of high unemployment, if assurance could be obtained through formally approved employment plans that as many of the resulting jobs as possible would be made available to the hard-core unemployed. As a result, a number of private industry and public works projects have been funded. Together, these give promise of more than 2,500 jobs, one-third of them for the disadvantaged unemployed, primarily Negroes and Mexican Americans. And other projects are anticipated. All these projects are being worked out by the Department of Commerce with the cooperation of private industry and also of the

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and State government agencies.

With a mandate under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to produce jobs in economically depressed areas, the Department of Commerce is now devising means to apply its Oakland techniques and policies in other areas. It is requiring as a condition of project approval that all beneficiaries, direct and indirect, present to the Department and to a citizens' review board complete hiring plans insuring maximum feasible employment for the disadvantaged.

For example, requests for public works funding from the city of Everett and other towns in the Seattle, Wash., area, which would help to provide facilities for a major aircraft company, have led to commitments from that company for large-scale employment of the disadvantaged. The company has also undertaken to give substantial help to the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center (one of the OIC centers discussed below) to provide machinery for MDTA training programs in the area, and to open employment opportunities to OIC "graduates" and, it is hoped, to Job Corps "graduates" as well. These and other commitments offer a prospect of employment opportunities with the company for between 3,000 and 4,000 disadvantaged persons within 2 years—a hiring schedule that is expected to repeat itself each 2 years thereafter.

Summer Jobs for Youth

The Youth Opportunity Campaigns, sponsored by the President and the Vice President during the summers of 1965 and 1966, revealed a lively interest on the part of employers in providing meaningful employment experience and income for the great numbers of students and other youth seeking jobs for the summer.

The 1966 campaign was carried out on several fronts, with impressive results. Large-scale promotional campaigns by the Federal-State Employment Service system, often in conjunction with civic-minded service organizations, resulted in the placement of boys and girls in 743,000 farm and almost 673,000 nonfarm jobs.

In addition, as a result of special competitive examinations, many young people obtained summer jobs as office workers and engineering, laboratory, and science aides in the Federal Government. Federal agencies were also asked, for every 100 regular employees, to create one extra summer job involving laboring or other routine work, to be filled by youth from low-income families who would benefit from guided work experience. More than 60,000 were actually hired, or more than 2 for every 100 career employees.

A variety of special summer projects also aimed to increase the employment and employability of youth. Some experimented with work training of mentally and physically handicapped youth or with youthful offenders. Others stressed efforts to combine work, education, and recreation in new patterns of summer development for youth.

An innovative and varied summer program was carried out in Youth Opportunity Centers with experimental and demonstration funds. This program employed high school graduates planning to enter college and some high school and college students, to help clear away backlogs of clerical work. It experimented with the employment of youth as community workers to do actual outreach and followup, and it used college students as interviewers and job developers to run summer placement services for other youth. This last approach appears to hold great promise, because local public employment offices have never been sufficiently staffed to meet the peak summertime demand for youth services. Altogether, the program provided direct summer employment for nearly 2,000 youth and, through its "do-it-yourself" aspects, opened opportunities for thousands more. The techniques developed were so successful in meeting peak-load client and operating needs that they are being refined for further application.

The President, in his message to Congress on America's Children and Youth, in February 1967, noted the success of the 1966 Youth Opportunity Campaign, and announced the establishment of a Cabinet-level council headed by the Vice President to promote summer youth opportunities. He also directed Federal agencies to continue their summer youth employment programs.

WORK-TRAINING PROGRAMS

New programs of work training launched under recent amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act will open job opportunities for greatly disad-

vantaged people and prepare them for meaningful work careers.[4]

The New Careers Program builds on pioneering experiences of the Community Action and MDTA programs and experimental projects in helping disadvantaged people enter subprofessional jobs, usually debarred to them, which offer promise of progressive work careers.[5] Unemployed adults (aged 22 or over) and those whose family income is below the poverty line are to receive work training through projects conducted by State and local government agencies and private organizations, with Federal financial support. The work training will be in activities of benefit to the community—for example, in the fields of health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, where personnel needs are expanding. Though workers will be employed initially as aides and in other entry-level positions, the projects must offer maximum prospects for their advancement to higher level jobs. Education, counseling, transportation assistance, and other supportive services will also be provided as needed.

The Community Employment and Betterment Program, authorized by the Congress in 1965, is directed to the needs of the chronically unemployed poor, who are unable, because of age or for other reasons, to secure training or appropriate employment under other programs. Projects set up under this program will provide work experience and training in activities which will improve the physical and social environment of the community—for example, in improving and beautifying parks and roadsides, rehabilitating community facilities and homes, and providing social and health services for the poor. The goal is to enable people participating in the program to qualify for permanent jobs in the competitive job market.

The basic objective of the Special Impact Program, authorized in 1966, is to solve critical manpower problems in urban communities or neighborhoods. The projects will be designed to serve as catalysts in structuring and coordinating activities under this and other programs, in order to improve the employment prospects of neighborhood residents and the social and physical environment of the neighborhood. Both youth and adults who are unemployed and from families with incomes below the poverty line will be eligible to participate. Essential supportive services will be provided, and there will be maximum participation of neighborhood residents in implementing the project, including their employment in the jobs created.

All three of these work-training programs, as well as the Neighborhood Youth Corps (discussed earlier in this chapter), will be administered and coordinated through the new Bureau of Work Programs set up in the Department of Labor.

Innovations in Occupational Training

The year 1966 was one of innovation in occupational training for both present and potential workers at many occupational levels. The broad redirection of the MDTA program was part of this effort. It was accompanied by a variety of additional developments and projects, frequently of an experimental nature, which are providing guidelines for future strengthening of the program. Innovation is also underway in the whole field of vocational education.

This section illustrates briefly some of the promising new approaches to training for the hard-core unemployed and to the use of upgrading training as a means of meeting skill shortages[6] and, second, suggests in a highly abbreviated way the range of advances now underway in vocational education.

NEW DEPARTURES IN THE MDTA PROGRAM

OJT for the Disadvantaged

Experience has demonstrated that the on-the-job training aspect of the MDTA program has

[4] Another program, now designated as the Work-Experience and Training Program, is discussed in the preceding section on improving employability.

[5] The underlying concept is that developed in Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor—The Nonprofessional in Human Service* (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

[6] For a broader discussion of the problems of skill shortage and approaches to meeting them, see the chapter on Skill Shortages and Occupational Training.

282-397 O - 67 - 3

some clear advantages over occupational training in a school setting. The psychological advantage is one—the fact that OJT is actual employment in a work setting, that it carries a paycheck with it rather than an "allowance," and that it leads much more directly and surely to continued employment after training. The additional practical advantages are that the training is directly relevant to the future job, and the employer, because he is paying wages to the trainees, has a positive investment and interest in the success of the project.

An important development in the attack on hard-core unemployment, therefore, is that more on-the-job training contracts are being written which call specifically for employment of the disadvantaged unemployed, minority groups, and youth completing Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps training. For example: Under an agreement entered into by the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (AFL–CIO) in the latter half of 1966, 1,500 on-the-job training slots will be developed for the disadvantaged in nine northeastern, midwestern, and mid-Atlantic States. Six IUE job developers are negotiating contracts with employers in the region, and the Labor Department is arranging funding and followthrough. The agreement specifically requires priority consideration for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees who are ready for employment. Recruiting is being arranged through the Employment Service.

Under another contract, the United Automobile Workers (AFL–CIO) is developing 2,000 on-the-job training opportunities with 20 auto parts supply firms in seven States, with 500 places set aside for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees.

In another project, nearing completion, six major defense contractors in the aerospace industry joined forces to provide immediate jobs together with training for 1,200 workers from the Watts area of Los Angeles and from other pockets of concentrated unemployment.

A significant national contract with a nonprofit agency, the Association of Rehabilitation Centers, will provide for training—upgrading and entry—for 900 persons in nonprofessional occupations to help alleviate the shortages in rehabilitation hospitals and related institutions. The trainees will be recruited from among the disadvantaged and, wherever possible, from those who have had preliminary work experience in the health field under NYC programs. This is a second contract, the Association having already successfully completed the training of 800.

Combining Shop and Classroom

Coupling of on-the-job and institutional training was accelerated in 1966, resulting in new opportunities for disadvantaged persons as employers agreed to provide skill training parallel to basic education, remedial work, or other supportive training.

Because of successful early experience with this kind of arrangement, an effort is being made to link a substantial amount of the on-the-job training provided under MDTA in coupled projects. Of the 50 national OJT contracts in effect at the end of the year, covering nearly 60,000 trainees, about half called for coupled training, and the new MDTA program emphasis will further advance this trend.

A national contract with the International Union of Operating Engineers calls for a 26-week coupled apprentice-entry program. Under another with the American Metal Stamping Association, arrangements will be made through subcontractors in 30 eastern and midwestern States for on-the-job training coupled with other training for 1,200 diesetters, inspectors, and punch press operators.

Under a prime contract with the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association, an experimental coupled program in Cincinnati is training men over 45 as operators of single machines, thus enabling the journeyman tool and die makers (who have had 8,000 hours of training) to devote full time to highly versatile, precise work. The arrangement is for 26 weeks of classroom work followed by 50 weeks of on-the-job training. This program for skill conservation and opportunity for the disadvantaged was instituted because of the expressed interest of the Department of Labor in expanding employment opportunities for the older unemployed worker.

Upgrading in Industry

One of the significant developments of 1966 has been the successful efforts made to spur upgrading training in industry. Besides enabling workers to move up the job ladder and thus helping to meet the demand for skilled personnel, these

programs are also opening opportunities for the disadvantaged in entry jobs.

—For example, under a national agreement with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1,000 journeymen are to be given training which will upgrade their skills, and 2,000 unemployed men are to be trained as carpenter apprentices. About half the trainees will receive preapprenticeship training in a coupled project and the other half will enter apprenticeship directly. The employers will receive OJT assistance for 26 weeks of the 4-year apprenticeship term.

—The same pattern is seen in a major pilot project, launched early in 1967 in New York City, to upgrade the skills of 2,500 employed workers. The four major unions and industrial leaders involved are committed to filling the vacated less skilled jobs with entry workers drawn from minority groups and the ranks of disadvantaged and long-term unemployed.

Training for Police Work

The recruitment of policemen from the disadvantaged persons whom they serve should not only provide entry opportunities for the disadvantaged but also improve community relations. In 1966, pilot projects involving MDTA institutional training were begun in several cities to train highly motivated but disadvantaged persons, particularly from minority groups, for police occupations. If successful the projects, developed by the Department of Labor in cooperation with the Departments of Justice and of Health, Education, and Welfare, will be forerunners of large-scale efforts to overcome the difficulty experienced by many cities in recruiting suitable police trainees, particularly from the ranks of disadvantaged Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans. Members of these groups often fail to meet employment criteria because of physical and educational deficiences, or do not seek opportunities in police work. The pilot programs are designed to determine how MDTA training can correct these deficiencies and help the trainees to qualify for entry into police work.

In New York City, for example, 1,000 volunteers, mostly Negro and Puerto Rican, are enrolled for half-year and 1-year courses of solid educational instruction and rugged physical training. The trainees have a firm goal and excellent motivation, and the dropout rate has been very low. The Police Department considers the training to be excellent and to be an extremely important element in police-community relations.

In his special message on Crime in the United States in February 1967, the President pointed to the tremendous needs for improving and extending the training of law enforcement officials, for recruitment of persons with an understanding of neighborhood problems into police work, and for a great variety of other actions to strengthen law enforcement, as discussed in the report of the National Crime Commission. He recommended the enactment of legislation which would, for example, authorize Federal support for institutes for education in law enforcement and for higher salaries for criminal justice personnel where associated with special training or innovative programs.

The Steel Industry Program

The steel industry, in cooperation with the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, is launching a series of projects to provide upgrading training for present steelworkers, together with intensive education and training for new recruits, including many members of minority groups, drawn largely from among the hard-core unemployed.

Current shortages of qualified steelworkers partly reflect the educational deficiencies of many workers now in the industry and also of those presently unemployed. Often workers with long service in the industry lack the education required for training and advancement to higher level jobs. With appropriate refresher or upgrading training, however, such employees could qualify for promotion to more highly skilled jobs or movement into the companies' apprenticeship programs. And many unemployed persons who do not now meet hiring standards could be helped to qualify for entry jobs through a combination of basic education and skill training.

Seven major steel companies, the Steelworkers Union, and the Government have therefore collaborated in developing a series of training projects. The Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide the education and training resources and training allowances necessary to support an MDTA pilot program at

steel plants in Baltimore and Chicago. The companies will join with the Government agencies in planning and conducting the training. The union will also cooperate in the program, providing special assistance in motivating workers to participate.

It is expected that, after evaluation of a variety of project designs to be tested in the pilot phase, the industry will continue and expand the program. Other industries with similar problems will watch the steel industry's experience closely to see whether the approaches developed are broadly applicable to other fields of work.

This project represents an important step in applying Government-sponsored training programs to the needs of a whole industry and in allying the schools and private industry in a joint effort to meet workers' educational and training needs. It also means the enlistment of industry and organized labor in an attack on hard-core unemployment which, if extended, could have a significant effect on some of the most difficult manpower development problems confronting the Nation.

THE OIC PROGRAM

The Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC)—developed in Philadelphia by the pioneering and resourceful pastor of a Baptist church, Rev. Leon Sullivan, with local, Ford Foundation, and MDTA support—has become the model for a growing number of similar community organized, largely minority group led programs. In the latter part of 1966, the OIC approach was extended on a demonstration basis to eight other cities, primarily smaller ones in which there were as yet quite limited manpower training programs: East Palo Alto-Menlo Park, Calif.; Erie and Harrisburg, Pa.; Little Rock, Ark.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Roanoke, Va.; Seattle, Wash.; and Washington, D.C. Planned enrollment is 400 to 1,200 a year, varying by city size. Funding is jointly by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare under MDTA and the Office of Economic Opportunity under its Community Action Programs.

The OIC stresses "self-help." With a motivational motto, "We Help Ourselves," it seeks financial donations locally and uses volunteers extensively. Its leaders have been primarily ministers, but it draws on nonchurch leaders as well, and seeks employer participation and donations of equipment and instructional aid. While much of the focus is on Negroes, purposeful efforts are made also to have white leaders, staff, and trainees. Trainees are *not* paid allowances.

The program has two chief parts, a "feeder" system and a skill training center. The feeder system (a) screens all applicants, (b) provides those deemed to need it with basic education and instruction in minority group history, work orientation, and good grooming, and (c) makes referrals to needed services of other agencies, directly to employment, to MDTA or other training opportunities, or to the OIC skill center. Most enrollments in the feeder preskill training are for 2 to 4 months.

The skill training centers' courses vary by city, but usually include electronics assembly, auto repair, machine shop, drafting, and secretarial training. Courses average about 6 months.

Literally dozens of additional OIC's have been initiated on a small scale in other cities without Federal funding, concentrating on feeder instruction alone, with largely volunteer staff. Plans are being developed for enlargement with Federal support in some of these cities during 1967.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A great expansion and redirection of vocational and technical education is now underway under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The expansion in facilities and far-reaching improvements in program content now in process should help greatly to meet the immediate training needs of youth and adults and, at the same time, to meet future demands for trained workers in a variety of office, distributive, trades and industrial, service, and technical occupations. Since the vocational schools provide most of the institutional training in MDTA projects, current advances in vocational education can also help to strengthen these projects.

Enrollments in vocational education courses increased to more than 6 million in fiscal 1966—including about 430,000 post-high school students, double the number enrolled in the previous year. The demand for training still exceeds capacity. However, construction of area vocational schools is beginning to relieve some of the pressure; the number of such schools increased from 405 in

fiscal 1965 to 756 in fiscal 1966. Besides providing full-time vocational education, these schools often enroll students who continue their academic education at nearby high schools and receive occupational training in the well-equipped shops and laboratories of the area schools.

Of particular importance in preparing young people for occupations with a present or prospective need for workers is the new flexibility in vocational school curriculums. Some 2,000 secondary schools recently established new occupational training programs—including training in such new fields as radiography, fluid power, instrument maintenance, and optical mechanics. At the post-secondary level, programs are being introduced or expanded in many occupations with acute personnel shortages, including nursing, dental hygiene, and X-ray, laboratory, and engineering technicians. Adult programs now include more than 2.5 million workers in programs for initial entry into or advancement in the work force.

Progress is underway also in developing programs tailored to the special needs of disadvantaged groups, such as inmates of correctional institutions, adults who lack basic education, and school dropouts.

Personnel Recruitment and Development

The expansion and reorientation of vocational education have brought an increased demand for qualified teachers, teacher educators, administrators, researchers, counselors, and other trained personnel and have also created an acute need to update the skills of present personnel. The identification of new occupations and the modification of teacher preparation programs in universities and colleges are being strongly supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through research grants. In the summer of 1966, HEW also sponsored training institutes and workshops structured to meet the needs of these different groups and particularly to familiarize experienced teachers with emerging fields such as psychiatric nursing, home care, machine-tool instrumentation, and numerical control.

To aid in the redirection of the MDTA program toward training of the disadvantaged, many State education departments have arranged for retraining or reorientation for vocational education teachers in techniques found to be useful in teaching students who are deficient in basic education as well as occupational skills. Other special programs and conferences have also focused the interest of vocational counselors on noncollege-bound youth. And three regional conferences on education, training, and employment (coordinated by the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, with the aid of a Vocational Education research grant) brought together school personnel and representatives of business, industry, labor, and government to consider the reshaping of vocational education in accordance with the changing economic and social environment of cities.

Vocational Education Research

Under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, 10 percent of the funds appropriated are to be devoted to research and development. This earmarking has led to widely varied research, seeking better ways to reach and train young people and adults from severely deprived backgrounds. To cite a few examples:

In the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, a demonstration training center (privately operated and funded jointly by the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity) is applying new techniques to the vocational, educational, and social skills training of 600 jobless out-of-school youth, and seeking sound methods for producing positive attitude and behavior changes.

Another important project, at Florida State University, will attempt to develop a computer-based literacy-training program of reading, writing, and numerical skills for grade levels two through seven. The project is designed to prepare and pretest a computer-assisted instruction program for teaching prevocational literacy skills to illiterate adolescents and adults.

In an attempt to bring to vocational education the newest developments in educational technology, a number of research and demonstration projects are being supported, involving computer-assisted instruction, closed-circuit television, and other new teaching media. One important project at Stanford University is attempting, through computer scheduling, to adapt vocational education to the individual needs of students. Rutgers

University is working on development of a model for a technological center to help keep vocational-technical teachers up to date in their fields of specialization. Another project involves the use of films on human relations for inservice training of teachers preparing to teach the disadvantaged.

Other projects are aimed at the development of cost-benefit measurements to evaluate the relative merits of vocational versus other kinds of education. Still others explore new approaches to increasing the supply of vocational and technical education teachers, such as the utilization of retired military personnel and of technicians in private industry.

Curriculum Development

Under the stimulus of the 1963 act, massive curriculum changes in vocational education are also possible and underway, aimed at orienting it more closely to current and emerging employment requirements. Although most of the curriculum research projects have so far been small and fragmented, directed toward particular subject-matter areas, pilot efforts to redesign entire curriculums are beginning to be much in evidence.

In the San Francisco Bay area,[7] for example, 19 high schools whose students come from varied social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds are now testing a program initiated in Richmond, Calif. (in a project coordinated by the Center for Technical Education, affiliated with San Francisco State College). The Richmond program came about when a group of high school teachers, financed by private foundation funds, met all summer to face the question too often in the minds of students: "Why in the world do I have to learn this?" The result was a plan of teaching related to the "real world." Instead of separating lessons under such labels as physics, mathematics, English, and shop, they used a sound synthesizer assembly kit as a basis for integrating the required knowledge—manual skills, sound-and-wave theory, the mathematics relating to the speed of sound and the plotting of curves, and the English needed for technical reports. A pinhole camera similarly led to new and interrelated learning. Discipline problems disappeared. And many of Richmond's potential dropouts went on to junior college. In the present 19-school experimental program, at least 78 percent of the students, all potential dropouts, say they are interested in going on to higher education.

This kind of approach points to a direction of real significance for the future. An advisory group, made up of outstanding educators, social scientists, leaders in the curriculum development field, and representatives of other disciplines, recently recommended to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the total curriculum must be redefined to meet the needs of students who do not now go on to college or are not equipped with occupational skills when they graduate from high school.

Meeting the Problems of Special Groups

The country's jobless and disadvantaged workers include many diverse groups. Most share the handicaps of inadequate education and lack of skill, and thus can benefit from the training and other programs already discussed. But special program adaptations and additional measures are frequently required to meet adequately the special needs of different groups such as unemployed older workers, American Indians, migratory farmworkers, and prison inmates. Significant advances have been made in the past year in aiding several of these groups.

OLDER WORKERS[8]

Special provision for counseling, training, and placement services for older workers is called for by a 1966 amendment to the MDTA.

[7] Bernard Asbell, "Case Studies in Change: New Directions in Vocational Education" (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, in process).

[8] For a further discussion of the specialized employment problems of older workers, see *1966 Manpower Report*, pp. 70–71.

This amendment was designed to help remedy a previous imbalance in MDTA programs. In 1966, workers aged 45 or over represented only 10 percent of all MDTA trainees, although more than 25 percent of all unemployed workers, many of them long-term unemployed, were in this age group. The relatively low representation of older workers in the training projects has been due partly to the legislative mandate that MDTA training must be in occupations where there is reasonable prospect of employment. Nevertheless, MDTA demonstration projects have shown that older workers can profit substantially from occupational training. Trainees in the 45-and-over age group have been almost as successful as younger ones in obtaining work.

Action to increase training and related services to older workers has been of three kinds.

First, the proportion of MDTA training opportunities earmarked for workers past 45 is being increased—to a goal close to their proportion of the unemployed. Difficulty in achieving this level is foreseen, however, unless aggressive efforts to create jobs for these workers accompany their recruitment into training.

Second, a marked expansion is underway in services to older workers through the public Employment Service system. Projects involving the establishment of special older worker service units in local Employment Service offices are already operating in five metropolitan areas, and similar projects will be set up in 20 more major cities before the end of fiscal 1967. By 1970, it is planned that similar units will be operating in each of the 56 largest metropolitan areas.

These units offer older workers intensified counseling and placement services and opportunities for referral to training, and also make extensive efforts to develop job openings for them. Needed health and other supportive services are supplied by cooperating community organizations. And through self-help groups, unemployed older workers are encouraged to share their jobseeking ideas and experiences, and learn new job-hunting techniques under the guidance of skilled counselors.

These improvements in employment services in themselves can have only limited effects, however, on increasing overall employment of older workers. The availability of job opportunities must be increased by anticipating needs in areas of employment expansion, such as those resulting from new Federal programs, and by the creation of job opportunities with public and nonprofit agencies, which will also help to meet community needs, as in health services and slum rehabilitation.

Third, a series of E&D projects has been set up to develop and test new methods of increasing older workers' employability and helping them find jobs. These projects are exploring, for example, the use of volunteers to reach older workers and to develop job opportunities; the extent to which the employment needs of workers over 60 can be met by mobilizing existing community resources; and the development of new techniques for motivating older workers to enter training. Another project demonstrates that employers can be persuaded to relax rigid age restrictions. It is expected that the techniques judged most effective will be incorporated into Employment Service operations in order to contribute to a general improvement in services to older workers.

Action to aid older workers will be further strengthened during 1967 by direction of the President. In his January 23 message to the Congress on Older Americans, the President stated that the Nation must end arbitrary age limits on hiring. And he directed the Secretary of Labor to establish more comprehensive counseling and placement services for older workers through the Federal-State Employment Service system.

AMERICAN INDIANS

The inordinately high rate of unemployment among American Indians, particularly those who live on reservations, is a matter deserving national attention. Some reservations have unemployment rates above 70 percent of the tribal labor force. Among the 100,000 Navajos, largest of the Tribes, unemployment stood at 45 percent in March 1966, according to a survey by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition, there is a large amount of underemployment on the reservations.[9]

To assess the manpower services available to deal with these critical problems, a survey of the 25 State Employment Service offices which serve reservation Indians was made in October 1966. All offices reported some activity in testing, counseling, and placement of Indian students and some special recruitment of Indians for agricultural

[9] For further discussion of the economic problems of American Indians and the programs designed to improve their status, conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, see *1966 Manpower Report*, pp. 74–75.

and construction work. Some MDTA training and demonstration projects were also being conducted in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and some efforts were being made in cooperation with employers and other State agencies to attract and staff industrial plants near Indian reservations. Because of restrictions on racial identification, only nine States had specific data on services to Indians; in these States, 23,466 placements of Indians were made in fiscal 1966. There was consensus among the States that much more can and must be done. The need for additional personnel and for funds for outreach and training of interpreters was emphasized.

As a result of these findings, all States with sizable Indian populations or reservations were asked to develop plans, as part of their Human Resources Development programs, for expansion and improvement of their services to Indians, whether living on or off reservations. All have submitted plans, and additional staff is being made available for this specialized program.

Additional improvements are being developed in line with recommendations submitted at the First National Conference on Manpower Problems for Indians, held at Kansas City, Mo., in February 1967. Leaders of about 200 Tribes and representatives of various Federal and State agencies and private organizations attended the conference, which was sponsored by the U.S. Employment Service. The recommended directions of action include developing better lines of communication between the Employment Service and Indian leadership, and efforts to give reservation Indians full access to all Federal and State manpower services.

MEXICAN AMERICANS

One of the most notable new efforts to develop an effective attack on employment problems of Mexican Americans, the largest minority group in the Southwest, was initiated late in 1966 through Operation SER (Service, Employment, Redevelopment).

Funded jointly by the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity, this project seeks to "enhance and draw on the capabilities of major organizations representing Spanish Americans in order to develop programs to broaden employment opportunities for the Spanish American minority." The project is under the direction of major Mexican American organizations: The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the American GI Forum, and the Community Service Organization (CSO).

SER has a staff, based in Albuquerque, which will promote and develop manpower programs for funding and provide technical assistance necessary to initiate such programs. It has also established a regional job skills bank.

The regional staff is to be supplemented in some cities by small local offices, which will undertake the detailed program development in these communities in close consultation with the State Employment Service and local Community Action agencies to link the new programs to overall local efforts. These offices will also initiate local jobs-and-skills rosters and referrals for Mexican Americans to broaden the activities of the regional job skills bank.

This effort is for five southwestern States: Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. The focus is on urban areas, with 11 cities designated as likely areas for development of local centers in primarily Mexican American neighborhoods, either as an identifiable part of established manpower programs or as additional separate centers, to provide information, referral, training, and placement assistance.

To assure that such programs to expand opportunity for the Mexican American minority are built into overall plans and allocations of resources for manpower programs in the Southwest, SER representatives will participate in State and local MDTA coordinating committees.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has also funded a statewide program in New Mexico for farmworkers, mostly Mexican Americans, under which 1,500 adults will receive full-time basic and prevocational education. Under a similar program in Arizona, the OEO and the Arizona Council of Churches are providing some part-time basic education for several thousand farmworkers and full-time basic education for 100 farmworkers, mostly Mexican Americans. Similar programs in Oregon and California, carried out through a variety of public and private agencies, provide part-time basic education for several thousand workers.

TEXAS MIGRATORY WORKERS

Workable answers to the employment and relocation problems of the largest concentration of migratory workers in the Nation—those in Texas—are now being sought cooperatively by a group of Federal, State, and local government agencies. The need for this joint action program was demonstrated in fiscal 1966. With Office of Economic Opportunity funds, the Texas Education Agency developed an adult education program designed to raise the educational level of 3,000 migrant farmworkers to as near the eighth grade as possible. Some vocational training was included but not enough to equip the workers to enter new occupational fields, and most of the "graduates" drifted back into the migrant stream, better educated than before but without marketable skills.

The target population is a limited group drawn from the State's more than 125,000 migrant workers, the majority of whom are home-based in south Texas, with the heaviest concentration in the lower Rio Grande Valley. Mechanization is rapidly shrinking their opportunities for farmwork, their present earnings average less than $1,200 a year, and their only skills are becoming obsolete. Besides having a low educational level, most of them have a language problem. Since the areas where they live are not industrialized, there is insufficient local demand to warrant large-scale training for employment in the area. Many of these workers are reluctant to move, because of family and community ties. The availability of low-cost housing (even though often substandard) in their present communities also keeps them tied down there. Yet training plus migration to industrial areas frequently represent their only substantial hope for employment and independence.

Plans for joint action, to commence early in 1967, were drawn against the background of these facts and of the 1966 experience. The new plan calls for some expansion in the size and content of the OEO adult education program for this group, and for a steady flow of trainees from this program into MDTA training for occupations, located largely in other areas, which promise adequate starting pay, regular employment, and a chance for advancement. And it calls for supportive services all along the way.

The total number of trainees under the OEO program will be increased to 4,200 from last year's 3,000. The courses will be open to other seasonal farmworkers as well as migrants. Major emphasis is being placed on adequate preparation of trainees for entry into MDTA programs, and it is estimated that about half the 4,200 trainees will be able to meet the requirements within a 6-month period.

DISADVANTAGED SERVICEMEN AND REJECTEES

Prior to 1966, more than one-third of all young men reaching military service age were being rejected for military service, about half of them because of low scores on the mental aptitude tests and the remainder mainly for failure to meet medical fitness standards.

After a thorough review, the Department of Defense decided late in 1965 on a carefully phased revision of the mental aptitude test requirements. Revisions in November 1965 and in April 1966 permitted the induction or enlistment of a total of 50,000 men who would not have been eligible previously.

As a result of this experience, the Secretary of Defense announced a more intensive and sustained program, named Project One Hundred Thousand, under which the mental aptitude test standards were further reduced in October and December 1966. Starting in February 1967, the military services will start accepting enlistments of men with physical defects which can be remedied in a short period of time by minor surgery, physical conditioning, or diet.

During the 12-month period begun in October 1966, 40,000 men will be accepted under these revised standards, and the goal for subsequent years is acceptance of 100,000 men per year who would not have qualified under the policies in effect before October 1966.

Project One Hundred Thousand has several closely related objectives. It is designed first to insure a more equitable sharing of the military service obligation among young men otherwise eligible for service. It recognizes that the military services now have an established capability for effectively training and utilizing individuals with marginal scores on the mental aptitude tests, as well as individuals with certain remediable medical conditions.

Finally, the policy recognizes that the highly developed training system of the military services

can help to raise the skill level of disadvantaged youth, and enable them to perform more effectively both in military service and in future civilian careers. Entrants into military service who are educationally deficient will be strongly encouraged to pursue basic education while in the service and to try to qualify for high school equivalency certificates. They will be given opportunities for assignment to a wide range of military occupational duties, many having close counterparts in the civilian economy. Current plans provide for careful monitoring of the progress of these entrants, both during their military service and in subsequent civilian employment.

On the civilian front, an encouraging pilot program for rejected volunteers has been carried out since 1964 through the National Committee on Children and Youth and the Employment Services in Baltimore and Washington, D.C., and is now being extended to several other cities. The Baltimore and Washington projects provided remedial education and counseling services for 2,200 youth who failed to pass the Armed Forces Qualification Test when they attempted to enlist. The aim was to improve the general skills and employability of the youth and also to enable many of them to pass the AFQT on a second attempt.

A followup study shows that 20 percent of them subsequently qualified for military service. In addition, 10 percent returned to school, 37 percent were employed, and 13 percent entered the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or coach classes for manpower training. Only 17 percent either were unemployed or could not be located at the time of the survey.

The projects for rejected volunteers supplement the Employment Service program for outreach and service to draft rejectees instituted in 1964. In fiscal year 1966, more than 41 percent of the 42,000 underemployed or unemployed rejectees interviewed were placed in employment (22 percent) or referred to training (19 percent).

PRISON INMATES

The doors of prisons and jails, which usher men out to freedom only to close thousands of them in again after brief intervals, have long been symbols of an unmet social need. It is futile indeed to keep a man behind bars for the stated time and then send him back, almost penniless, to the environment from which he came—no better prepared to earn an honest living than before or, if prepared, with little prospect of getting and keeping a job. Yet prison facilities for social rehabilitation and for skill training relevant to today's job market have been largely inadequate or nonexistent.

With the hope of providing prisoners with more fruitful preparation for return to civilian life, plans were nearing completion at the end of 1966 for a pilot training program for prisoners, as authorized by a 1966 amendment to the MDTA. Stimulating this legislation and the resulting action are the findings of MDTA research and E&D projects. Several have shown the feasibility of training programs for prison inmates and the effectiveness of these programs in vocational rehabilitation, provided that they are carefully planned and accompanied by extensive supportive services.

The first MDTA-supported project, jointly financed by the Department of Labor and the New York City Department of Corrections, was in the municipal jail on Rikers Island in New York City. And projects have since been conducted or are currently underway in seven other correctional institutions in five States.[10] Research evidence from the Rikers Island study indicates that young offenders can benefit from programs of vocational instruction and remedial education, even though they are in jail for short periods of time. This study also points up the urgent need for intensive efforts at job development and placement to overcome the former inmates' handicap of a prison record.

The E&D project conducted at the Draper Correctional Center in Alabama provides a good example of the constructive—even dramatic—results which can be achieved. This project concentrated on giving offenders sustained incentives to undertake and complete training, so as to secure a steady, legitimate job after release. It was found that the many inmates deficient in basic education could be readied for vocational training in less than 6 months (for example, as welders, barbers, radio-TV repairmen, and technical writers). Companies hiring the first group of released trainees were

[10] The theoretical bases and some preliminary findings of these and other projects were outlined in the *1966 Report of the Secretary of Labor on Manpower Research and Training Under the Manpower Development and Training Act* (Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, March 1966), pp. 93–97. See also *Training Needs in Correctional Institutions* (Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, April 1966), Manpower Research Bulletin No. 8.

reported anxious to hire more. Within a relatively short period after the inmates were released, recidivism had amounted to only 19 percent among the former trainees, compared with 65 to 70 percent among men released before the training program began or currently released without training.

Under a new MDTA pilot program, training will be provided in fiscal 1968 and 1969 for 5,000 inmates broadly representative of those in Federal, State, and local institutions. Most of the training will be given on the prison site, although it may be given elsewhere in cases where work-release laws exist. For offsite training, inmates may be enrolled in ongoing MDTA courses. Remedial education and prevocational training will be provided as necessary. Flexibility in designing projects to meet individual needs and in trying out techniques of instruction will be encouraged. And counseling, individualized placement services, and followup after release will be emphasized. The training is to be for occupations in which the demand for workers is widespread, not merely local, since many of the released inmates will wish to seek jobs in places distant from the correctional institution.

Incentive payments of $20 a week, plus dependency allowances, will be paid to the accounts of trainees in some projects, to test their effect in motivating prisoners to complete training and otherwise aid in rehabilitation. However, most of this money will be held in reserve, to be paid to the inmates as "gate money" upon release.

This program is being planned with the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the U.S. Office of Education, as well as the public Employment Service and other interested agencies. The widespread inquiries already received from State and local correctional officials give assurance of their broad participation and support.

Pioneer work with offenders is also being undertaken by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Enlargement of the definition of physical and mental disability to include behavioral disorders has stimulated the establishment of vocational rehabilitation units within correctional institutions and in parole and probation settings. Among the services provided are diagnostic evaluations, counseling, work adjustment training, physical restoration services, job placement, and followup counseling. By the end of 1966, most States had vocational rehabilitation programs serving the public offender.

Since 1961, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has supported 38 research and demonstration projects which have the public offender as the focus of service or investigation, or both. The most comprehensive is the Federal Offender Rehabilitation Program. Developed in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, the Federal Probation Service, and the U.S. Board of Parole, this series of projects is evaluating the effectiveness of different methods of providing vocational rehabilitation services to the public offender, so as to provide a firm basis for future program development.

The VRA has also made training grants designed to increase the number of rehabilitation experts experienced in working in correctional institutions. And under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965, it is helping to finance a 3-year program of research on personnel practices and needs in the field of correctional rehabilitation.

Under the program recommended by the President in his special message on Crime in the United States, additional Federal aid would be provided for innovative State and local programs to develop new rehabilitation techniques and personnel, as well as for a great range of other efforts to strengthen law enforcement and prevent crime.

New Administrative Policies

New administrative arrangements designed to make manpower programs more effective were developed during 1966. The first major step was to bring together appropriate agencies and staffs—at national, State, and local levels—to plan a coordinated attack on the problems involved. This gave rise to the planning of a comprehensive approach to manpower programs, involving the De-

partments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. It resulted also in arrangements for joint funding of many individual projects, so as to provide a wider variety of services and more adequate financing for them. In addition, the practice of setting national goals for the guidance of States and of requiring State plans for manpower programs for the year ahead was instituted during the year.

THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

The need for a comprehensive coordinated attack on the problems of the disadvantaged by the various government agencies with relevant programs has been a recurrent theme in this chapter. As evidence has grown that a many-faceted approach is required to effectively aid the disadvantaged, the competence and facilities of a growing number of specialized agencies have been drawn on. This trend has made possible more flexible shaping of programs to meet human needs, particularly in urban slums. But it has also heightened the need for coordination of effort, which was accordingly a major aim of manpower policy during 1966.

A Selected Cities Task Force consisting of members of the various manpower agencies of the Department of Labor had been established near the end of 1965. Its mission was to stimulate planning and coordinate and expedite manpower activities in 21 major cities in order to increase the effectiveness of the department's programs there.

The experience of such task forces led to the creation in early 1966 of three-man teams representing the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. These teams were assigned to 30 major metropolitan centers to assist local manpower groups "in utilizing in the most efficient manner possible the resources available to the community under Federal legislation."

The teams operate under the guidance of a subcommittee of the President's Committee on Manpower, composed of representatives of the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget, and the three agencies providing personnel for the teams. The teams' responsibilities include identifying unmet manpower and training needs, exploring existing Federal programs in their areas, and expediting action to effect any needed improvements. They also encourage community groups to marshal both public and private resources to assure jobs and training for the community's jobless workers. Beyond that, they have as long-term goals achieving maximum participation of local and State agencies in the planning of manpower programs and the deployment of the available resources and insuring that the programs so complement and supplement one another that maximum benefit is obtained from each dollar spent.

An outstanding example of the need for and effectiveness of a coordinated approach in meeting the complicated problems of disadvantaged groups is provided by the Texas project for migrant workers discussed above. This project entailed the following cooperative efforts in programing and funding:

—The Texas Employment Commission has selected the occupations for which workers should be trained (taking into consideration labor demand, educational requirements, and wage levels). It will also select the trainees, provide counseling services, and pay training allowances.

—The OEO Community Action agency staff, trained by the Employment Commission, conducted employer surveys to further pinpoint the demand for workers. In addition, Community Action agencies in various cities will assist in recruitment and referral of migrants to the Employment Commission and will work with the schools to motivate the trainees and encourage mobility. And they will provide extensive assistance in moving and in finding new homes for families going to new areas to get jobs.

—The Texas Education Agency is developing the necessary training programs, including occupationally oriented basic education.

—The Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is developing the on-the-job training phases of the plan and is cooperating in arranging for coupled institutional and OJT programs.

—The Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce cooperated in the planning of training in two areas of critical unemployment.

—And the Texas Department of Public Welfare offered cooperation in areas where work-experience projects for needy persons were in existence under the Economic Opportunity Act and agreed to provide supplementary assistance as necessary to meet the needs of the trainees' families.

It is hoped that this cooperation will mean a new start for more than 4,000 migrant workers and their families.

Two other programs, already discussed because of their importance as new directions of program action, are also key examples of comprehensive, organized approaches to services for the disadvantaged. These are the multiservice neighborhood centers to be developed in slum neighborhoods throughout the country and the Special Impact Program, under which a number of Federal agencies will join with private groups in a much more comprehensive, far-reaching attack on the problems of joblessness and rising tensions in several ghettos.

JOINT FUNDING

A significant aspect of recent coordination efforts has been the increasing number of manpower projects funded jointly by two or more Government agencies. In the past, local programs have sometimes lacked elements essential to their success because these elements could not be financed through the originating agency, and the timing problems inherent in obtaining simultaneous approval and funding for separate elements of a project from several independent agencies often proved insurmountable. Now, increasingly, through coordinated action by Federal agencies concerned, agreement is reached in advance on needed elements of a given program, with each agency accepting responsibility for its elements and undertaking financing of them in time for an agreed-upon starting date.

For example, the statewide Mississippi MDTA project discussed earlier, which will have a total cost of $9 million, has been developed and carried out through the cooperative efforts of the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. And it was funded from appropriations under three different pieces of legislation—the Manpower Development and Training, the Economic Development, and the Economic Opportunity Acts.

NATIONAL-STATE PLANNING

The National-State Manpower Development Plan, initiated in April 1966 to guide investment of MDTA funds, and the State Manpower Plans related to it provide the blueprint for achieving the redirection of MDTA training programs called for in early 1966. They constitute the start of a planning system which should do much to insure that training programs are continually geared to changing job market and human needs.

As a first step, the Department of Labor, after consultation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity, developed policies, guidelines, and program goals for the MDTA program for fiscal year 1967. The policies required the development of State Manpower Development Plans which were to be reviewed and approved by the Federal agencies concerned. The approved State Plans were to constitute the plans of operation for MDTA training programs within the State.

To guide the States in developing plans for the year, national targets with regard to the numbers of trainees in institutional, on-the-job, and coupled training programs were specified. Goals were also set for training various groups of disadvantaged individuals, for training in redevelopment areas, and for training for skill shortages.

The guidelines called for organizing State and local coordinating committees to assist in arriving at local and State Manpower Development Plans geared to the National Plan. The committees' responsibilities are also to include advising and assisting on such matters as identifying occupational training needs, arranging for specific training programs, and recommending the types of training most suitable for certain situations or occupations. Ideally, representation on the committees should include not merely the State Employment Services and State apprenticeship and training, and vocational education agencies, but also community action, vocational rehabilitation, welfare, economic development, and urban facilities planning agencies, as well as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and all other agencies with manpower responsibilities.

State Manpower Development Plans, based on the national guidelines and formulated with the advice and assistance of the coordinating committees, were developed and submitted by all States. These were reviewed by a National Interagency Coordinating Committee, consisting of representatives from the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Agriculture, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which made recommendations to the Labor Department for approval, disapproval, or modification of each plan.

The new National-State Planning System has thus made possible (1) concrete advance planning at the national level in accordance with national trends and needs, (2) State and local advance planning which takes account also of current and projected manpower needs at these levels, and (3) a formally coordinated approach to planning and conducting training programs, involving the various agencies and organizations at all levels. In addition, the system provides a background of information for extension of the planning system to other manpower programs so as to achieve a comprehensive planning approach.

Toward the end of 1966, agencies administering the several closely interrelated manpower programs decided to establish a system for jointly and cooperatively planning their respective program operations for fiscal year 1968—from the area job market on up. The salient point in this joint undertaking is that it will aim at inclusion of all manpower-related programs in cooperative local and State planning, not just the MDTA program as was the case in planning for fiscal 1967.

The new comprehensive Area-State Manpower Planning System is designed to put into the hands of State and local agencies information about all manpower program resources expected to be available to them in the next fiscal year, well before the year begins, so that they will be able to lay out integrated programs for deploying these limited resources against their most pressing manpower problems. On a national basis, this coordinated planning should make possible steady progress toward optimum allocation of resources in developing the potentialities and improving the utilization of unemployed and underemployed manpower.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1967—O-282-287

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D.C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
Wolf Avenue and Commerce Street, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1365 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
730 17th Street, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
Curtis C. Aller, Director